REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

New claims 22-24 have been added.

This amendment adds, changes and/or deletes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

The disclosure of Applicant's application provides support for the amendments to the claims. For example, at least page 6, lines 23-27; page 7, lines 1-3; and Figure 1 and its related text provide support for the amendments to the claims.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-24 are now pending in this application.

Interview Summary

Applicant's representative wishes to thank the Examiner for conducting the telephone interviews of September 23, 2010 and October 18, 2010. In accordance with the request in the Interview Summaries that the Applicant file a statement of substance of the interviews, please be advised that the Interview Summaries accurately summarize the interviews.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-8, 11-13, 15, 16, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,511,015 to Heikkilä *et al.* (hereafter "Heikkilä") in view of U.S. Patent No. 2,975,499 to Lapp (hereafter "Lapp"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Heikkilä discloses an asymmetric blow suction module 12 mounted above a web 10, which includes a blow nozzle unit 14 with a nozzle surface and a first discharge suction unit 18 on a front side 16 and a second discharge suction unit 22 on a back side 20. See Heikkilä

at col. 3, lines 50-62. The blow suction module 12 is located between two gas infra modules 24, 26 and the blow nozzle unit 14 has a bottom part 28 with two nozzles or nozzle gaps 30, 32. See Heikkilä at col. 3, lines 57-62, and Figure 1. The bottom parts of air discharge units include bottom plates 40, 42 that are bent downwards into a V-shape and contain suction openings 38. See Heikkilä at col. 4, lines 19-22.

However, Heikkilä does not disclose a non-contact infrared drier installation for a passing web comprising, among other things, gas-heated infrared radiant elements arranged next to one another so as to form a unit, wherein said infrared drier installation comprises a recycling device and a device preventing suction of cold air between two adjacent rows of radiant elements in said unit, wherein the device preventing suction of cold air between two adjacent rows of radiant elements fills a space between the two adjacent rows of radiant elements in said unit such that a device preventing suction of cold air is located between each and every element in said unit, wherein the device preventing suction of cold air physically blocks a flow of air between the two adjacent rows of radiant elements, as recited in claim 1. Claims 2-8, 11-13, 15, and 16 depend from claim 1.

The Office argues on page 2 of the Office Action that the nozzle surface 34 of the blow nozzle unit, the suction openings 38 of the air discharge units 18 and 22, and the bottom plates 40 and 42 of the air discharge units 18 and 22 of Heikkilä provide a device that prevents suction of cold air. However, these blow nozzle unit 14 and the air discharge units 18 and 22 do not provide a device preventing suction of cold air that fills a space between the two adjacent rows of radiant elements of the gas infra modules 24, 26 or physically blocks a flow of air between the two adjacent rows of radiant elements of the gas infra modules 24, 26. As shown in Figure 1 of Heikkilä, a space is formed between the blow nozzle unit 14, air discharge units 18, 22 and the gas infra modules 24, 26. In addition, the blow nozzle unit 14 and air discharge units 18, 22 do not fill a space or block a flow of air between the individual radiant elements of each of the gas infra modules 24, 26, as recited in claim 1. Because of these gaps and spaces shown in Figure 1 of Heikkilä, the device of Heikkilä simply does not provide the device preventing suction of cold air recited in claim 1.

Lapp discloses a ceramic tunnel kiln that uses jets of air. See col. 31, lines 6-31. The Office argues on pages 4-5 of the Office Action that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the device of Heikkilä by the teachings of Lapp to provide a device preventing suction of cold air, as recited in claim 1. In particular, the Office explained during the interview that Lapp would provide a device that prevents suction of cold air by providing jets of air that counter suction of cold air by essentially blowing back a suction of cold air.

However, even if such jets of air are disclosed by Lapp, the jets of air do not provide a device preventing suction of cold air that fills a space between the two adjacent rows of radiant elements in a unit such that a device preventing suction of cold air is located between each and every element in said unit, wherein the device preventing suction of cold air physically blocks a flow of air between the two adjacent rows of radiant elements, as recited in claim 1. Jets of air do not fill a space and physically block a flow of air. As a result, Lapp fails to remedy the deficiencies of Heikkilä.

For at least the reasons discussed above, the combination of Heikkilä and Lapp does not render claims 1-8, 11-13, 15, and 16 to be unpatentable because the combination of Heikkilä and Lapp does not disclose all of the features of claim 1. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 9, 10, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Heikkilä and Lapp. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claims 9, 10, and 14 depend from claim 1. Heikkilä and Lapp do not render claims 9, 10, and 14 to be unpatentable because Heikkilä and Lapp do not disclose or suggest all of the features of claim 1. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Heikkilä and Lapp in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,665,950 to Riepe *et al.* (hereafter "Riepe"). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Riepe fails to remedy the deficiencies of Heikkilä and Lapp discussed above in regard to independent claim 1, from which claims 17-20 depend. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

New Claims

New claims 22-24 have been added. Claims 22-24 depend from claim 1 and are allowable over the prior art for at least the reasons discussed above and for their respective additional recitations.

Conclusion

Applicant submits that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing or a credit card payment form being unsigned, providing incorrect information resulting in a rejected credit card transaction, or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date November 8, 2010 By _____

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 295-4011
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

Glenn Law
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 34,371

Kevin McHenry
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 62,582